

May 17, 1977

LB 539, 532

SENATOR MARVEL: The bill is returned Senator Simon. Do you want to move the adoption of your amendment?

SENATOR SIMON: I would move for adoption of the amendment. I would just say that in closing as far as I know in the past years, or at least the past year there was additional money that was returned and from every indication there would be no reason why the \$100,000 could not be absorbed. I would personally be in favor of the amendment even if we had to pay additional costs. It does not appear at all that that would be the case.

SENATOR MARVEL: The motion is to adopt the Simon amendment to 539. All those in favor vote aye, those opposed vote no. Have you all voted? Record.

CLERK: 27 ayes, 0 nays on the motion to adopt.

SENATOR MARVEL: The motion is carried, the amendment is adopted. Senator Cullan do you want to move 539 to E & R for Engrossment.

SENATOR CULLAN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature I move 539 as amended be advanced to E & R for Engrossment.

SENATOR MARVEL: All those in favor say aye. Those opposed say no. The motion carries, the bill is advanced.

CLERK: Motion on the desk. I move to return LB532 to Select File for a specific amendment, signed Senator Warner.

SENATOR MARVEL: Do we have to adopt the E & R amendments first?

CLERK: It is already on E & R.

SENATOR MARVEL: Okay. Chair recognizes Senator Warner. Do you have an amendment to 532?

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, that is the one that strikes the....

CLERK: DeCamp-Schmit amendment to LB 532, as amended by the Warner amendment, adopted on May 11th.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, I am offering this amendment. This was the amendment that was adopted the other day prohibiting the Department of Roads from expending any funds for the removal of signs. It was amended, and I offered an amendment to that prohibition, siting the rationale was the pending legislation, LB 534. All of you received, in your mail boxes I believe last Friday or yesterday, correspondence from the Director of State Engineer Tom Doyle, indicating his concern that if that amendment stayed on that we could jeopardize a portion or all of the highway user funds from the federal government. The amendment I am offering here entirely strikes the amendment. If this one does not go, I should tell you I have a second amendment which would only prohibit the expenditure of funds for removal of signs as identified in the pending legislation, LB 534. I offer the amendment. Since I received a letter indicating the possible loss, I want to offer

04646